

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandris, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/480,645	01/10/2000	Timothy A. Laverty	IMGXP01 4567 EXAMINER	
22434 75	90 03/29/2004			
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			WALLERSON, MARK E	
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DERREELT, C	34704-0770		2626	Ь
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(c)				
<b>—</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/480,645	LAVERTY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark E. Wallerson	2626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period who reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	is(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C.§ 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Se	eptember 2003.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 16-44 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 16-30 and 32-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 31 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of the	epted or b) objected to by the idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Second is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Applications to the comments have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	d) □ Interview Summer	(PTO 413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### Part III DETAILED ACTION

# Notice to Applicant(s)

- 1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on 9/15/03.
- 2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 16-44 are pending.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 16-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 16, the phrase a "normalized" EPS file in line 9 is unclear.

With respect to claim 16, the phrase "a consistent format" in line 9 is unclear.

With respect to claim 16, "a variety of software applications" in line 11 is indefinite.

- 5. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the information " in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. Claim 25 recites the limitation "the color information" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 09/480,645

Art Unit: 2626

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 16-30, and 32-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vogt et al (Vogt) (U.S. 6,611,349).

With respect to claims 16, 17, 23, 25, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, Vogt discloses a source Encapsulated PostScript file (which reads on a Postscript file) (column 11, lines 32-44), wherein the Postscript file contains unstructured information required to create a printed document (column 11, lines 32-44); a first conversion module for automatically converting the Postscript file to a PDF file using a first set of parameters (column 11, lines 32-44); a second conversion module for converting the PDF file to normal Postscript file (approved for printing) using a second set of parameters, wherein different software applications (software infrastructure) can use the information to access the Postscript file (column 13, lines 26-40).

With regard to claims 18, 26, and 39, Vogt discloses a Prepress operation (column 10, lines 27-43).

With respect to claims 20, 35, and 41, Vogt discloses the predefined parameters include a consistent format for color information (column 10, lines 16-43).

Application/Control Number: 09/480,645

Art Unit: 2626

With regard to claims 21, 28, and 42, Vogt discloses a Postscript interpreter (which reads on server (110)) for converting the Postscript file).

With regard to claims 22, 29, and 43, Vogt discloses a PDF library for converting the PDF file (column 13, lines 34-40).

With respect to claims 24, 30, and 44, Vogt discloses the Postscript, PDF and normalized Postscript files are stored on a file server (110).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claims 19, 27, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vogt in view of Stumbo et al (Stumbo) (U.S. 6,084,688).

With respect to claims 19, 27, and 40, Vogt differs from claims 19, 27 and 40 in that he does not clearly disclose a Level 1 Postscript file. Stumbo discloses a printing system wherein a PDF file is converted to a Level 1 Postscript file (column 7, lines 36-52 and column 9, lines 22-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Vogt wherein the PDF file is converted to a Level 1 Postscript file. It it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Application/Control Number: 09/480,645

Art Unit: 2626

have modified Vogt by the teaching of Stumbo in order to improve the output of the jobs to the printing apparatus.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington. VA.

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

MARKWALLERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

MARK WALLERSON